

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated February 13, 2008. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 2-6, 8-10 and 13-26 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 11-12 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 13 and 16-20 are being further amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to correct a minor formal error and to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention. New claims 21-26 are being added. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-6, 9-10, and 17 would be allowed if rewritten into independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claims 5-6, 9-10, and 17 are being rewritten into independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and all other claims depend from the allowed claims, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over an article entitled "Recognizing Characters in Scene Images" by Ohya et al. in view of Bauer et al. (US Pat. No. 6,751,603) and newly cited O' Hair (US 5,315,668), and claim 15 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ohya, Bauer '603, and O' Hair in view of an article entitled "A Method for Recognizing Character Strings from Maps Using Linguistic Knowledge" by Akira et al., and claim 20 was rejected over Ohya, Bauer '603, and O' Hair in view of the newly-cited Yahagi (US 2002/0064311).

Since claims 1, 7 and 11-12 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the remaining claims are being amended to depend from the allowed claims, the rejections thus become moot.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

April 7, 2008

SPF/JT